



Norman H. Bangerter
Governor

Dee C. Hansen
Executive Director

Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.
Division Director

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340

October 29, 1991

TO: Minerals File

FROM: Tony Gallegos, Reclamation Engineer *dag*

RE: Site Inspection, Geokinetics Inc., Seep Ridge Project,
M/047/002, Uintah County, Utah

Date of Inspection: October 25, 1991

Time of Inspection: 1430 - 1730

Conditions: Cold, unsettled

Participants: Jim Lekas, Geokinetics; Tony Gallegos, Holland
Shepherd, DOGM;

The purpose of this inspection was to evaluate the latest proposal by Geokinetics to reclaim the last of three ponds at the Seep Ridge Project site.

We met with Mr. Jim Lekas at the Lexco, Inc. Bag Plant near Pelican Lake before going to the Seep Ridge site. Jim is the son of Mike Lekas who is the designated operator for Geokinetics. After a brief discussion regarding the purpose of the inspection we left for the site.

The project site is mostly revegetated and reclaimed, with the exception of several structures which will continue to remain as long as the site is in a state of suspension. Geokinetics has proposed to reclaim pond #3 in the same manner in which the other two ponds were reclaimed, specifically: 1) rip the liner in place, 2) roll the liner into a corner of the pond, 3) cover the liner using the material comprising the berms and/or the stockpiled material, 4) regrade the pond area to blend in with the surrounding contours and be non-impounding, 5) place topsoil material over the regraded area, and 6) seed the area.

Ground water pumped from the oil shale retorts had originally been pumped into the other ponds and then separated from the oil and pumped into pond #3. Mr. Lekas indicated that no oil had been transferred into pond #3. At the time of this inspection some water had collected in the low spots of the pond liner due to recent precipitation events in the area. Some salts from the

Page 2
Site Inspection
Seep Ridge Project
M/047/002
October 29, 1991


repeated evaporation of the original retort water and natural surface water was evident in the pond. Mr. Lekas indicated that this collection and concentration of salts was one reason why Geokinetics wanted to reclaim the pond. Several old remains of birds were found in or near the pond. It was thought that these birds had died from ingesting water which contained a high concentration of these evaporated salts. It seems that over the years of exposure to sun and the freeze-thaw cycle, the liner has begun to pull apart at the seams. Geokinetics wishes to reclaim this pond before the salts have a chance to contaminate the soils or groundwater.

The Division has no concerns with the proposed method of reclaiming pond #3. The previous two ponds were reclaimed in the same manner as previously approved by the Division and the Department of Health, now the Department of Environmental Quality, (DEQ). Provided that this proposal still meets with the approval of the DEQ, Geokinetics may proceed at their earliest convenience with the reclamation of pond #3. In addition, the Division will evaluate the current reclamation estimate to determine if an adjustment in the amount is justified.

jb
cc: John Blake, State Lands & Forestry
Dennis Downs, DEQ
Mike Lekas, Geokinetics
M047002.1

October 13, 1987

TO: File

FROM: Frank J. Filas, Reclamation Engineer 

RE: Site Inspection, Seep Ridge Project, M/047/002, Uintah
County, Utah

On September 17, 1987, I inspected Geokinetics' Seep Ridge Project. This mine site on state land was granted an indefinite suspension after much of the surface area was reclaimed in the fall of 1986. The reclamation bond was reduced from \$150,000 to \$93,425 at that time.

The areas that were regraded and seeded have produced an excellent crop of weeds (kochia). There are small amounts of trash and debris in some areas, and the site is beginning to acquire the rundown look of an inactive site. The weeds may not be a real problem, but I would recommend that a vegetation specialist look at the site in early to mid-1988. If additional seeding is necessary in the fall of 1988, I would also recommend that the trash and debris be removed at that time.

clj
cc: J. Blake, State Lands and Forestry
L. Braxton
F. Jensen
1312R/4